

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

10 Elena del Campo, et al., NO. C 01-21151 JW

11 v. Plaintiffs,

12 American Corrective Counseling Services,
13 Inc., et al.,

14 Defendants.

15 /
16 **ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFFS TO
17 FILE STATEMENT OF CLARIFICATION
18 RE: CLASS DEFINITION**

19 The Court has taken under submission Plaintiffs' Amended Motion for Class Certification
20 (hereafter, "Amended Motion," Docket Item No. 643) and Plaintiffs' Supplemental Motion for Class
21 Certification (hereafter, "Supplemental Motion," Docket Item No. 684).

22 In reviewing Plaintiffs' motions, the Court has observed a discrepancy between the sub-
23 classes Plaintiffs move to certify in the Amended Motion and those Plaintiffs seek to certify in the
24 Supplemental Motion. Specifically, the Amended Motion describes four subclasses, including a
25 "Misrepresentation Class," which Plaintiffs define as "[a]ll members of the Umbrella Class from
whom ACCS collected money after December 11, 1999." (Amended Motion at 3.) The Amended
Motion also describes a "Bank Records Class," which consists of "[a]ll members of the Umbrella
Class whose bank records ACCS obtained after October 8, 2000." (*Id.*)

26 The Supplemental Motion, however, only describes three sub-classes and omits the
27 "Misrepresentation Class." (Supplemental Motion at 2-3.) In addition, the Supplemental Motion
28 redefines the operative starting date of the "Bank Records Class" to be December 11, 1999, which

1 had been the date associated with the "Misrepresentation Class" in the Amended Motion. (Id. at 3.)
2 Nonetheless, the Supplemental Motion later refers to "subclasses one through four." (Id. at 10.)

3 The Court directs Plaintiffs to file a statement of clarification with the Court on or before
4 **October 31, 2008.**¹ In this statement, Plaintiffs shall clearly articulate the definitions of their
5 proposed Umbrella Class and any associated subclasses.

6
7 Dated: October 29, 2008


JAMES WARE
United States District Judge

25
26 ¹ The Court does not seek any responsive papers from Defendants on this issue because the
Court treats the discrepancy as a clerical error. In addition, given that both Plaintiffs' Amended
Motion and Plaintiffs' Supplemental Motion are still operative, the Court finds that Defendants have
27 had an opportunity to raise objections to the subclass at issue.

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1 **THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THIS ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO:**

2 Charles D. Jenkins cjenkins@jgn.com
3 Charles Edward Perkins cperkins@jgn.com
4 Dan Day Kim dkim@jgn.com
5 David L. Hartsell dhartsell@mcguirewoods.com
6 Deepak Gupta dgupta@citizen.org
7 Eric Neil Landau elandau@jonesday.com
8 Lester A. Perry lap@hooleking.com
9 Martha A. Boersch mboersch@jonesday.com
10 Natalie P. Vance nvance@klinedinstlaw.com
11 O. Randolph Bragg rand@horwitzlaw.com
12 Paul Arons lopa@rockisland.com
13 Ronald Wilcox ronaldwilcox@post.harvard.edu
14 Susan L. Germaise sgermaise@mcguirewoods.com
15 Timothy P. Irving tirving@rdblaw.com

16 **Dated: October 29, 2008**

17 **Richard W. Wieking, Clerk**

18 **By: /s/ JW Chambers**
19 **Elizabeth Garcia**
20 **Courtroom Deputy**